| ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 7/15/65 | DATE RECEIVED |
|---|---|---|---|

A. PUBLICATION DATA

| 1. ERIC NUMBER | 2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). | 3. IDENTIFICATION NO. |
|---|---|---|
| ED002063 | N.A. | N.A. |

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Blackman, Allan

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Planning and the Neighborhood School

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Integrated Education Issue 10

7. EDITOR(S): Weinberg, Meyer

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: ORG. University of Calif. ST. Berkeley, California CITY, STATE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Integrated Education Associates, 343 South Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE

| 10. VOL. | 11. PAGES | 12. MO./YR. | 13. TOTAL PP. |
|---|---|---|---|
| II | 49-57 | March 1964 | 9 |

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☑ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (3-12)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| integrated education | neighborhood schools | school location | |
| equal opportunities | open enrollment | | |
| community planning | citywide schools | | |
| | rezoning districts | | |

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Neighborhood schools have long been a part of community planning; however, a primary negative consequence of these schools is segregation. The schools in the low economic areas are slighted, and the child in these schools is surrounded with pupils who have the same problems he has, thus providing little motivation for improvement.

Some alternatives for neighborhood schools are: rezoning for larger neighborhoods, combining two school districts, building educational parks and citywide schools, closing slum schools, carefully locating new schools for future population growth, busing children or other transportation plans, and using open enrollment.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OF PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED002063

The second consequence of open enrollment was the external impact on the local school district area and the white parents in the receiving school. It is apparent from this study that considerable resistance and latent hostility exist toward the new program. Some parents have taken their children out of the public school and sent them on to private and parochial schools. Yet others have responded by serving as special tutors in a remedial reading program to assist the newcomers. Some, however, have begun to articulate their opposition to integration and the modification of the neighborhood school concept through such vocal organizations as Parents and Taxpayers (PAT).

Certainly there is a lesson to be learned from the open enrollment program and other methods to bring about equality of educational opportunity and a democratic society through its educational system. The citizen attitudes reported here raise in bold relief the many assumptions of sentiment and willingness of the northern white community to receive Negroes into their neighborhoods. Also, the study raises serious questions as to the ability of school leaders and administrators to create the climate necessary for successful school integration.

# PLANNING AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

Allan Blackman

*The author is Post Graduate Research Assistant, Center for Planning and Development Research, University of California, Berkeley. The article is expanded from a talk, March 21, 1964, to the American Institute of Planners, California Chapter, Northern Section.*

The "neighborhood unit" as a planning concept has been cogently attacked on a number of occasions during the past twenty years. Despite these attacks, the idea of a neighborhood remains among the cherished values of most urban planners. "From Atlantic to Pacific and from Canada to Mexico, the basic Perry neighborhood unit, with only minor modifications, has served as the development module." (3,p.8.)

Part of the reason that the attacks have been ignored was succinctly stated in December, 1960, by the American Society of Planning Officials *Planning Advisory Service*. Its "Information Report No. 141" stated: "Without arguing the validity of the overall Isaacs-led critique, it is safe to say that the attack was measurably weakened by the absence of a concrete alternative proposal." (3,p.7.) The report goes on to assert that ". . . it appears that much of the momentum of the opposition movement has been exhausted." (3,p.8.) [See *Integrated Education*, December, 1963, p. 22, references to the criticisms by Prof. Reginald Isaacs.]

While the opposition movement among planners may be exhausted, recent events in New York, Chicago, Berkeley and elsewhere make it clear that there is a new, vigorous opposition stemming from the civil rights movement. This new opposition is not concerned with the entire neighborhood unit idea. It is concerned with the neighborhood school which Clarence A. Perry proposed as the social and design focal point of the neighborhood unit. (20) The new opposition proposes a definite social alternative, the racially integrated school.

Given the powerful legal and political attacks now being made upon the neighborhood school idea, it is the duty of the planning profession to reconsider its commitment to this



REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

form of school organization. We still have the time to try to develop alternative forms of school organization which can satisfy the goals of educators, planners and the civil rights movement. If we do not try, we may be forced to accept alternatives developed in the heat of political battles which satisfy no one. As part of this reconsideration, I would like to raise the following questions: What are the purposes and values of the neighborhood school? Are the values of the neighborhood school more important than the values of racial integration of schools? Can we achieve both the goals of the neighborhood school and the goal of racial integration? What are the alternative forms of school organization?

*The purposes of the neighborhood school.*

The neighborhood school attempts to achieve four key goals.

*First:* The neighborhood school provides the cheapest, safest and fastest means of transporting the child from home to school. The farther a school is from the home, the more time is spent in the transportation process, the more streets, especially major streets, that must be crossed by the walking child, and the more we feel obliged to transport the child with expensive public transportation.

*Second:* Many educators believe schools should be small. (10, p.178.) The neighborhood form of organization helps keep them small.

*Third:* "Educators believe that young children benefit from the security that comes from learning and living in the same, familiar environment." (14; 7, p.277, footnote 62.) They feel that children should be able to have their classmates as after school playmates and that they should be able to return to school for after school classes and programs. (23,p.115.)

*Fourth:* This major purpose is quite complex but best summarized by saying that educators want a close relationship between the school and the family. "The neighborhood school should, and often does, serve as an invitation to parents to know, confide in, and work with its staff. This offers a good chance for constructive community pressures on the central school administration and the political authorities for local school improvements." (14) Thus the neighborhood school can reflect the values and goals of the community it serves, and can gain that community's loyalty and support. Stated from a different perspective, the neighborhood school is a reflection of the belief that education should be locally controlled.

*An evaluation of the goals of the neighborhood school.*

1. *The transportation problem:* The transportation problems which the neighborhood school attempts to solve should be divided into four seperate problems of time, walking distance, safety and cost.

Time: Minimizing the amount of time spent going from home to school is important both to avoid wasting time and to avoid fatiguing the child. Most educators say an elementary school child should not spend more than thirty minutes getting to school, a secondary school child should not spend more than an hour. The time factor does not appear to be an important determinant of the neighborhood school since in thirty minutes a child can walk or bike considerably more than three quarters of a mile. If a child is driven to school, he can probably go from four to ten miles in thirty minutes. (18)

Safety: The safety of children going to and from school is extremely important, of course. The concern for safety appears to be a key factor in determining standards for walking distances. It appears to be assumed that the danger of accidents increases directly with the distance a child walks and the number of major intersections he crosses. Are these assumptions correct? Is not the child's safety more related to the types of traffic situations he confronts rather than the distances he walks? Is not a child safer crossing a major intersection with traffic controls than a minor intersection without controls? I raise these points as questions because I have not yet had the oppor-

tunity to investigate what research there has been on this matter. It is interesting to note that the New York board of education recently adopted proposals which set a walking distance limit of 2-1/2 miles for elementary school children. (19) If children can safely walk 2-1/2 miles in a city with bad weather, a grid street pattern and dangerous traffic, I think we can allow children elsewhere to walk more than three quarters of a mile, which is the walking distance limit now generally established. (18) Furthermore, if safety is paramount, children should be driven from home to school since the parents' car, public transportation or a school bus are all probably safer than any walking trip on even the safest streets.

Walking distance: Walking distance as a factor separate from the time and safety factors is a problem only if the distance is so great that the child becomes fatigued.

Most educators say an elementary school child should not walk more than three quarters of a mile, a secondary child not more than two miles. I doubt that these distances tire children. I doubt that even a thirty minute walk could so tire a child as to interefere with classwork. Again, New York's 2-1/2 mile walking limit is significant.

Cost: We rightly begrudge the cost of transporting children to school because we would rather spend the money for the more important factors of education such as salaries, buildings and books. However, where educational goals can be achieved only by transportation to distant schools, Americans have generally paid the cost, the time cost as well as the money cost. In Philadelphia, all crippled children are bused to one school where they receive a special education they could not possibly get in any other form of school. For some children, the trip takes over an hour. In all rural areas, we pay the cost of buses because we know that farm children can get a good education only in large, centrally located schools. Parents who believe in private schools also willingly pay the transportation cost. The largest illustration, of course, is the parochial school which in many instances requires use of public transportation or school buses. Roman Catholic parents have also paid the cost. The point made by these examples is that where educational goals can be achieved only by transporting children to relatively distant schools, the cost of such transportation has been paid.

Clearly, alternatives to the neighborhood school should involve as little transportation cost as possible. Unfortunately, the only forms of transportation generally considered are no-cost walking or very high cost school buses. Other alternatives should be considered. Even young children can, and have, safely used public transportation presumably at less cost than special school buses. Organized car pools manned by parents can be developed. (Many parents already drive their children even to the closest schools.) (21)

2. *The school size problem.*

The second goal of the neighborhood school is to keep schools small. It is important to realize that school size is not a function of location but of organization. If the ideal size for an elementary school unit is 400 pupils, and if we have a central location drawing 2,000 pupils, there is no reason why we cannot build five separate buildings at the one location or why we cannot, even in one building, create five school units. Some so-called "tracking" systems have create educationally and socially been attacked just because they separate schools in one school building. (13, 23, 22)

In reading what educators say about the question of school size, I have been impressed by the fact that big schools are confused with over-crowded schools. (10,p.178) Bad planning, bad luck or inadequate expenditures for facilities can over-crowd or overuse a small neighborhood school just as they can a large school.

Elementary schools with 500 or less pupils are generally considered ideal. This standard appears to reflect the subjective judgment of educators

rather than any objective measures of efficiency or educational accomplishment. (15;8; 18,p.45) In contrast an Arkansas school study states: ". . . in practice it is difficult to determine just what the maximum limits should be . . . Few national guideposts are available for help in setting enrollment limits." (21) I have concluded that with proper planning and administration and with adequate operating budgets, we could have much larger schools. As one authority on the subject has stated, "When a school plant is actually planned in every detail to care for the enrollment it houses, the question of optimum size is settled." (11, p.53)

The fact that larger schools may not be undesirable is extremely important because frequently the small size of neighborhood units is determined not by any of the other factors discussed in this report but simply by the factor of small school size.

An historical note is interesting in this discussion of school size. In 1929 when Clarence A. Perry first wrote about the neighborhood unit, he considered elementary schools with 60 classrooms and 1,200 or more pupils as desirable. (20)

3. *Child security:* The third goal of the neighborhood school is providing the child with a sense of security by having the school as part of the home environment. The factors which make a child feel secure at school are varied and complex. I doubt that the physical location of the school or the physical separation of home and school are important in establishing this security. Two recent studies (22, 23) have pointed out that lower-class students feel quite insecure in school, indeed feel alienated in school, even though the school is close to home. These feelings of insecurity result from the attitude of the lower-class home toward education and the attitude of the schools toward the lower-class child. At least in the case of the lower-class children whose home environments frequently are insecure and depressing, it could be argued that they would benefit more from a school located in a different environment. Lower-class children frequently have home environments which provide an inadequate and unstimulating range of experiences and for these children new experiences and varied experiences may be more important needs than security.

The problems of the middle-class child are not the same as those of the lower-class child but this does not mean that even the middle-class child feels secure in school simply because of the physical location of the school. Again it is relevant to point to the children who presently attend schools not physically close to their homes. I have yet to discover evidence that crippled children, rural children, private school children or parochial school children feel insecure simply because of the distant location of their schools.

4. *Parent support of schools:* The fourth goal of the neighborhood school is a close relationship between the school and the family. Here again the evidence indicates that this close relationship is not simply a question of physical proximity. A close relationship between school and home is important at the secondary school level and it is achieved even though the secondary school is much farther from the home than the elementary school. Again we have the example of the private schools, parochial schools and other non-neighborhood schools. In many of these schools I suspect there is a closer relationship between school and parents than there is in the neighborhood school.

The crucial factor in establishing closeness between home and school is the ability of the home to control the standards, atmosphere, and the goals of the school. This control is generally exercised through the school board and the school district. The centrally located academic high schools and demonstration elementary schools are examples of parents creating non-neighborhood schools with which they have a close relationship through pressure on a school board. The relationship is close because the parents can politically control the character of the schools.

Even though there is no necessity to

achieve parental control through physical proximity of school and home, it is the case that in most northern and western communities control actually has been achieved by locating the schools close to the home. Because of this pattern in the North and the West, arguments against integration based on a defense of the neighborhood school frequently reflect the fear of white, middle class parents that they will lose control if the neighborhood school is eliminated.

Why do parents want control? To a considerable extent they want it for its own sake. In a democracy all citizens would like to feel they can control their destiny especially as it is affected by such an important institution as the school. In addition, the white, middle class parent wants control to achieve goals of specific content concerned with the quality, quantity and character of education. These goals include the imparting of social and class education by the school.

Frequently, if not generally, the white, middle class has had few positive ideas of what it wanted to achieve; but it has had one very definite negative idea. It has wanted to keep its children's schools from being dominated by Negroes, by the children of the slums, by lower class and deprived children of all sorts. The white, middle class fears these children because it feels they will lower the educational and social standards of their own children. (That these fears may be ill-founded is irrelevant; the white, middle class has acted on the basis of these fears.)

To prevent this domination has meant to segregate, but the separation of the slum children from the white, middle class children could not be accomplished in the North and the West as it had been in the South. The way of accomplishing this separation indirectly was residential segregation in conjunction with the neighborhood school concept. This combination has allowed the white, middle class to retain the control it desired.

Where the white middle class has remained in the big cities, having their schools within their neighborhoods has made these schools easily identifiable and has permitted the school boards to give them special favors. If the neighborhood changed social composition, the school, i.e. the teachers, the children, the special facilities and the special favors, could move with the parents to their new retreat. Most white, middle class parents have fled to the suburbs, of course, where they have established class segregated school districts over which they have intimate control. (22,Ch.III) It seems certain that any alternative to the neighborhood school, any proposals for school integration, must successfully deal with these desires of the middle class, white parents to control the schools.

*Negative consequences of the neighborhood school.*

In order to understand why the civil rights movement is attacking the neighborhood school so vehemently, it is important to understand not only the four arguments for the neighborhood school but also the particular ways in which the neighborhood school damages children from lower income families in general and the Negro children in particular.

1. One of the most evil consequences of the neighborhood form of school organization is that it has allowed many school systems to seriously slight the educational needs of children from lower income areas. Documentation of this mistreatment is provided in the book *Education and Income*, by Patricia C. Sexton, Associate Professor of Educational Sociology at New York University. Professor Sexton's book is a study of the Detroit school system. The book demonstrates that by every quantitative and qualitative measure of educational service, schools serving areas with families of below average income receive significantly inferior treatment than do schools serving areas with families of above average income. In terms of class size, number of substitute teachers, age of school buildings, quantity and quality of school facilities, safety and healthfulness of school site, amount of

school play space, and in terms of special services, by all these measures the lower income schools receive significantly inferior treatment than do the upper income schools. One set of statistics from Professor Sexton's book will do to illustrate the unfair distribution of expenditures in the Detroit School System. Of the schools serving areas with average income of less than $5,000, 42% serve no free meals or free milk. Of the schools serving areas with average income over $9,000, 22% serve no free meals or free milk.

One of the significant points of Professor Sexton's book is that the unfair distribution of educational services is not a racial problem, but a class problem. She points out that white areas with below average income receive just as bad educational service as do Negro areas. (23, p.16)

The unfair distribution of educational funds in Detroit is not unusual. It can be found in many other if not most other American cities. It is only recently in a few cities such as Oakland and New York that a small effort has begun to give equal or extra help to schools in lower income areas.

Professor Sexton's book helps explain why many people in the civil rights movement are sceptical of the proposition that what is needed is not school integration but improvement of the schools in the Negro areas. The proposition may be true. But if it is, why haven't these improvements been made in the past?

2. The second negative consequence of the neighborhood school relates to the importance of classroom stability. In order to receive an education, the child must stay in one classroom long enough to establish the needed relationship with one teacher. The importance of this fact is indicated by recent proposals for having children stay with one teacher for the first three grades. (23, p.269) But the lower income family is very mobile with the result that each time the family moves, the child must change schools. Professor Sexton's study revealed that in Detroit among children from families with income below $5,000, 49% either entered or left a school during one semester. In contrast, among children from families with incomes over $9,000, only 17% entered or left a school during one semester. (23,p.96) Clearly for children from mobile families the neighborhood school is not a help, it is a hindrance. Such children would be much better off if they were assigned to one school and guaranteed transportation to the school regardless of where their home was.

3. A basic problem is that the neighborhood school *is* a segregated school. The segregated school reinforces and symbolizes residential segregation. It encourages feelings of inferiority and reinforces the low self-image of the culturally deprived child. It is a symbol of society's rejection of the Negro and the lower classes. (4)

4. The segregated neighborhood school surrounds the lower income child with people who have the same problems he has. There are few good examples from which he can learn and gain motivation. He is surrounded by peers who have difficulty reading who do not look forward to vocational rewards and who do not have manners and social graces. (9, p.31)

5. The segregated Negro community and lower class communities in general do not have the resources to help their schools as do the white, middle class communities. Crushed by the experience of slavery and the past hundred years of prejudice and segregation and southern deprivation, the Negro community does not have the strength of other *immigrant* groups. It lacks the money, the training, the social and political organization. (12)

6. Most books on school planning describe the sort of pleasant environment in which a school should be located. Yet to have a neighborhood school in a lower income area frequently means to locate a school in an unpleasant environment of dirt, heavy traffic, mixed land uses and social diseases. This enviornment is one of the factors which drives good teachers away from such schools.

*Alternatives to the neighborhood school.*

I believe that the implication of the above analysis is that the neighborhood school is not sacrosanct and that attempts to alter this pattern of school organization cannot be dismissed simply by waving the flag of the neighborhood school idea. Alternative forms of school organization aimed at achieving integration or aimed at achieving better schools must be considered on their merits. What are some alternative forms of school organization?

1. *Larger neighborhoods* are one alternative which would retain many of the values of the neighborhood school while, in some specific situations, ameliorating some of the negative consequences. If we simply change our standards for neighborhoods by enlarging schools and increasing walking distances we can in some situations create integrated neighborhood schools. Rather than design neighborhoods to fit school standards, land planners under this alternative would design neighborhoods to which educators would fit schools.

2. *The school village* or educational park consists of several schools located on one large campus. The idea was originally proposed for New Orleans. (2) Because of the extremely high value of land in the slum areas of New Orleans, it was estimated that construction of schools on cheap suburban land would cost less even with the added cost of busing than would construction on expensive slum land. The idea was not adopted and it is sad to report that New Orleans recently purchased an expensive three acre site for a junior high school in the slum area. A three acre site for a junior high is very small by most standards. Can it be seriously argued that this substandard neighborhood school is better than an adequate school outside the neighborhood? The school village, as well as other plans which call for schools to have larger service areas, would help eliminate difficult planning problems which result from trying to estimate population growth for small areas, from the difficulty of keeping neighborhood schools in areas where there is growth, and from the problem of peak enrollments.

3. *The Princeton Plan* takes two or more schools and treats them as one. If there are two schools, all of the children from the enlarged service area go to one school for the first three grades and to the second school for grades four, five and six. Theoretically, the plan can involve the combination of as many schools as there are grades. As with other plans that create larger schools, the Princeton Plan has educational advantages in that it enables the use of team teaching, specialized teachers and other devices which require a larger student body.

4. *Open enrollment* plans generally permit Negro children to transfer out of a segregated school to an integrated school which is under-utilized.

5. *Closing of slum schools* which are old would promote integration and increase educational quality if the slum children were transported to new schools in white, middle class areas.

6. Redrawing service district boundaries, *larger school districts*, as in the California plan for county wide school districts, and *site selection procedures* aimed at placing new schools in between segregated neighborhoods can achieve integrated schools where there are Negro or lower-income and white, middle class communities in close proximity.

7. *City-wide schools* are possible, especially as school districts become larger and permit the development of specialized schools. However, specialized schools, such as the all academic high school, can promote segregation if their specialty does not draw students from a variety of backgrounds.

8. *The busing of children* into other areas can accomplish integration. Planners should note that as more children are driven to school or come by public transportation, the criteria for a good school site may change to include a location near an arterial road or a transit line.

9. *Boarding schools*, day schools which hold children from breakfast through dinner, and special summer

schools may be necessary for children from unstable families. These schools could be located in integrated areas as adjuncts of regular schools.

10. *Especially desirable sites* might be used as school locations regardless of the location of the homes of the students. Thus schools might be located near transportation terminals, near parks and museum centers, or near industries which can provide vocational students with part time jobs.

11. Schools can be located in areas where population growth is expected while initially serving older areas with declining populations of children who would be bused to the schools.

12. Imaginative transportation plans can also create alternatives to the neighborhood school. What would be the result of having children attend schools near the location of their fathers' jobs with the father driving the child to school and with special programs organized to keep the child until the end of the fathers' work day?

REFERENCES


1. American Public Health Association Committee on Hygiene and Housing, *Planning the Neighborhood*, (Chicago, Public Administration Service, 1960).

2. American Society of Planning Officials, *Planning 1963.*

3. American Society of Planning Officials, *Neighborhood Boundaries*, Planning Advisory Service Information Report No. 141, (Chicago, 1961).

4. Kenneth B. Clark, *Prejudice and Your Child*, 2nd ed., (Boston, Beacon Press, 1963).

5. James Bryant Conant, *Slums and Suburbs*, (New York, McGraw-Hill book Company, 1961).

6. Council for Civic Unity, "Race and the Schools," *Newsletter, Oct. 1962.*

7. Wylie H. Davis, "St. Louis," *Civil Rights U.S.A.: Public Schools — Cities In The North and West—1962*, (Washington, D.C., Superintendent of Documents).

8. Detroit City Plan Commission, Comprehensive Planning Division, *Proposed Standards for Public Educational Facilities, 1960.*

9. Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association of the United States, *Education and the Disadvantaged American*, (Washington, 1962).

10. N.L. Engelhardt, N.L. Engelhardt, Jr., and Stanton Leggett, *Planning Elementry School Buildings, 1953.*

11. N.L. Engelhardt, N.L. Engelhart, Jr. and Stanton Leggett, *Planning Secondary School Buildings, 1949.*

12. Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Beyond The Melting Pot, The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*, (Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1963).

13. John S. Hadsell, Chairman, De Facto Segregation Study Committee, *De Facto Segregation In The Perkeley Public Schools*, (Berkeley, California, Unified School District, 1963).

14. Fred Hechinger, "Neighborhood School Concept," *New York Times*, June 26, 1963.

15. Frank W. Hubbard, "How Big is a Good School," *Elementary School Buildings — Design for Learning*, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association.

16. Seymour Martin Lipset, *De Facto Segregation in Berkeley and the Common School Tradition*, Mimeographed.

17. Zane Meckler, "De Facto Segregation in California," *California Teachers Association Journal*, January, 1963.

18. National Council on School House Construction, *Guide For Planning School Plants*, 1958.

19. *New York Times*, January 30, 1964, p. 16.

20. Clarence Arthur Perry, "The Neighborhood Unit," *Regional Survey of New York and Its Environs*, Volume VII, 1929.

21. Pulaski County (Little Rock, Arkansas) Metropolitan Area Planning Commission School Planning Project, *Standards for School Planning*, 1957.

22. Frank Riessman, *The Culturally Deprived Child*, (Harper & Brothers, 1962).

23. Patricia Cayo Sexton, *Education and Income: Inequalities In Our Public Schools*, (New York, The Viking Press, 1961).

## PENNSYLVANIA'S AFFIRMATIVE INTEGRATION POLICY

*Complete text of a statement, "Affirmative Action Policy on Education," adopted by the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission and released on June 13, 1964 by Commission Chairman Harry Boyer.*

### PART I
### GUIDELINES FOR FULLER INTEGATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Commission endorses the goal of integration as essential to sound education and our democratic way of life.

The problem of educational institution policy and practice is how to involve minority group persons into complete membership in the student body and faculty. The problem is aggravated by de facto school segregation caused principally by discrimination in housing and by large numbers of Negroes living in segregated areas. The racial imbalance which results in many of the public schools of Pennsylvania from discrimination and de facto segregation makes difficult if not impossible the most effective antidote to discrimination, namely, person-to-person contacts across group lines between teachers and classmates from various racial, religious and nationality cultures.

Even when school segregation is the result of housing conditions and not because of deliberate discrimination, the Commission feels it necessary that affirmative steps must be taken by boards of public school districts to alleviate racial imbalance, regardless of its cause. Positive, corrective measures are often feasible and it is not justifiable for boards of public school districts to take refuge in the fact that the original condition of segregation is not of their making.

To help eliminate de facto segregation and to accelerate total integration, the boards of education of the public school districts throughout Pennsylvania should observe the following guidelines:

1. Every public school district must strive to foster desegregation and integration of schools and to improve the quality of school programs and teaching to the highest educational level. The purposes of desegregation and improved quality education are interdependent and must be pursued simultaneously. Efforts to achieve integration should never be conducted so as to diminish the quality of education. Educational improvement programs in public schools should include